

REMARKS

This application contains claims 1-6, 9, 11-20 and 23-35. Claims 1, 4, 15, 24, 27, 30 and 33 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiner Abdi for the courtesy of a personal interview granted to applicant's representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856) on July 21, 2003. An understanding was reached that claims specifying the use of multiple aliases to identify different advertisers, and the use of such aliases for the purposes of payment to the advertisers, would be considered to be allowable over the prior art of record. It was agreed that applicant would submit a Request for Continued Examination with an amendment drawn to this feature of the present invention.

Claims 15, 16, 20, 27, 28, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Messer (U.S. Patent 5,991,740) and over Barber (U.S. Patent 6,157,917), while the remaining claims in the application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Messer in view of Barber. While disagreeing with the grounds of rejection cited by the Examiner, applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 15, 24, 27, 30 and 33 in the manner agreed upon in the interview in order to further clarify the distinction of the present invention over the cited art.


Claim 1 now recites clearly that a plurality of different aliases are provided to represent a network address of an item offered by a merchant for sale on a page per fee basis at a predetermined price, wherein all of the plurality of aliases represent the same network address. The merchant assigns respective aliases to a plurality of advertisers for use in advertising the item.

Each respective alias is assigned by the merchant to specifically identify a respective one of the plurality of advertisers, for the purpose of payment to the advertiser for sales of the item made via an advertisement posted by the advertiser. These added limitations are recited in the specification, for example, on page 5, lines 27-30. As discussed in the interview, they are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art, which uses other means of identification in order to make payments. In view of this amendment, claim 1 is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Amendments in a similar vein have been made in claims 4, 15, 24, 27, 30 and 33. In view of these amendments, these claims are likewise believed to be in condition for allowance, as are the remaining dependent claims in the application.

Applicant believes the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully ~~submits that all of the claims in the present application~~ are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,


S. Peter Ludwig
Registration No. 25,351
Attorney for Applicant

Darby & Darby P.C.
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 527-7700